Clauses 1 to 13, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Sales-Tax (Third Amendment) Bill, 1958, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Sales-Tax (Third Amendment) Bill, 1958, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE NON-AGRICULTURAL LOANS BILL, 1958.

Motion to Consider.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Non-Agricultural Loans Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Non-Agricultural Loans Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration."

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—This is a very simple measure. In the Belgaum Division there is an Act known as Bombay Non-Agriculturists Loans Act. That Act provides for the grant of loans to non-agriculturists for the purpose of building houses and for repairing houses. According to several enactments listed in clause 2 of the Bill, there is provision for granting loans to agriculturists for agricultural purposes. We intend to advance loans for erectting or repairing houses. I do not think there is any controversy with regard to this grant of loans to agriculturists for construction or repair of houses. I commend this Bill for the acceptance of this House.

*Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—I appreciate the laudable object in bringing this Bill. But, I fail to understand why the Government did not bestow its attention to find out whether there are any other means by which the same purpose could have been served, *viz.*, for grant of loans to agriculturists for erecting or repairing houses. As a matter of fact I say that if suitable modifications are done in the bye-laws governing the Co-operative Societies, the same purpose could have been achieved. Necessary provision can be made in the bye-laws governing the Co-operative Societies Act, to extend loans to agriculturists for non-agricultural purposes also. It is in vogue in other States where the loan that has been given under short term loan is not covered for agricultural purposes. So, if there are modifications to that effect in the Co-operative Societies Act, I think the same purpose could have been achieved as enumerated in this Bill and we could have easily avoided this Bill itself. I believe in Madras this is in vogue. They are issuing loans for all purposes other than agriculture.

Secondly, it has been contemplated that they would spend Rs. five lakhs if this Bill became law. This amount is sought to be made by reappropriation from the amounts that has already been sanctioned for some other purpose. I should like to question the Government as to how they are justified in diverting the amount set apart for issuing loans to agriculturists. Supposing a certain amount is set apart for a specific purpose, how is the Government justified in diverting that amount for some other purpose. I do not understand the significance or principle involved in the procedure that has been mentioned in the Financial Memorandum. Therefore, I submit that I am against this provision.

4-30 P.M.

If the Government is serious and if it is convinced that an enactment like this is necessary, then I suggest that they may provide a separate fund for this purpose. The Government has taken the power to frame rules under section 6. The interest that is proposed to be charged on the loan has not been mentioned. The security that is to be furnished by the borrower has also not been mentioned. All these things have to be prescribed under the rules. Supposing a person complies with all the requirements laid down in

(SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

the rules, is there any provision which says that he should be given the loan? It is not mandatory according to the provision in this Bill and the discretionary power is vested with the sanctioning authority either to grant or to reject the loan. I think the phrase is loosely worded. Instead of the word 'may' if some other word had been put in, I think it would have been more apt. First of all, there is no necessity for this Bill because the purpose can as well be served by resorting to the provisions of the Co-operative Societies Act, by giving more loans to co-operative societies, by giving to the co-operative societies the power to extend the loan to non-agricultural purposes also. Secondly, there should be a separate fund for this purpose and there is no justification whatsover to take from the amount that has been earmarked for giving agricultural loans. What is the rate of interest you are going to charge is not known. Suppose you charge more than 6 or 9 per cent, what is to be done? Should it not be disclosed? I do not understand what is the difficulty on the part of the Government at least to mention the rate of interest and the security to be furnished by the borrower here. It is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons 'for the relief of distress'. If poor people are in distress, how can they borrow money without offering security under section 4? They are required to give security and if that is so, how can people in distress seek any relief? Does this mean that Government is not going to render relief to the poor people? Is there any other provision of law under which the poor people who are in distress can be afforded relief? The words 'for the relief of distress' are really ambiguous and I think the purpose can as well be served by having a provision to the effect 'in deserving cases relief should be given free of interest'. How can a person take a loan and repay it when he is not able to get any relief that he wants? Therefore, I submit that it is unnecessary. Even if the Government thinks it necessary to provide for non-agricultural loan, a separate fund has got to be created for fulfilling the intention of this Bill.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjanagud).—Sir, I want a little clarification. Under the existing rules of law, what is the budget head from which loans are being sanctioned for non-agricultural purposes? Nowhere is it mentioned. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is mentioned that a provision of Rs. 40,000 has been made in the Budget for 1958-59 under 'Loans and Advances by State Government—Miscellaneous Loans and Advances (e) Other Loans—95 Loans to Non-Agriculturists., Where is the necessity for this and why not make a bigger provision under that budget head and eliminate the cumbersome procedure of enacting a law?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, under the several enactments mentioned in section 2, agriculturists are being advanced loans for agricultural purposes like purchasing cattle and bullocks, sinking wells, taccavi loans, etc. We are also advancing land improvement loans. They are not getting loans for non-agricultural purposes like repairing houses, etc. My friend Sri Venkatai Gowda made much of the fact that co-operative societies are advancing loans. To what extent the raiyat is benefited I cannot say. No doubt, there are provisions which enable the co operative societies to advance loans to agriculturists for non-agricultural purposes. But here we take power to advance loans to agriculturists for non-agricultural purposes. I do not know why the Hon'ble Member should come in the way of the Government giving some kind of relief to the agriculturists.

As regards the clarification asked for by the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya, I may say that there is statutory provision to grant non-agricultural loans in the Belgaum Division and we are seeking to extend that law to the other regions of the State. I do not know whether I have cleared his doubt. In the Belgaum Division there is what is known as the Bombay Non-Agriculturists' Loans Act in operation and so budget provision has been made to advance loans to agriculturists for non-agricultural purposes. In the rest of

the State there is no such law. So, we want to extend this law which is in force in Belgaum Division to other areas of the State by means of this Bill.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am not opposing this Bill. If relief is going to be given to agriculturists by this Bill, I won't come in the way. But the explanation has not cleared the doubt in my mind as to the need for it.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Under the Co-operative Societies Act, the co-operative societies can advance short-term and medium-term loans to agriculturists and others. People who are keen on establishing industries can take loans under the enactments governing industries. But in the case of agriculturists who are not in a position to secure loans either from the co-operative societies or from other agencies for non-agricultural purposes, this Bill makes provision for giving that help to them.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is it not possible for the co-operative societies to extend loans to agriculturists for non-agricultural purposes?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has already replied to that point.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is it not possible to provide a separate fund which, if not created, will diminish the sum earmarked for agriculturists? It will also be not conducive to the development of agriculture.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—It is our experience that in spite of our best efforts allotment made for takavi and other allied loans will not be spent. Therefore for this year five lakhs will be diverted for this purpose.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA (Tumkur).—How long it will take to frame rules under this Act?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Very early.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—It may mean a month or two years or ten years as in many other cases.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—After framing rules they should be placed before this House because you may frame rules of your own fancy which may be detrimental to the purpose itself.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I do not know whether my learned friend is trying to make much of the fact that Government has got powers to fix the rate of interest and the mode of recovery. Government is bound to help the agriculturists. I do not think that any Government will levy interest detrimental to the interests of the raiyats.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಪುರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶ . . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—Is this a final reply or an interim reply?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ!

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—May I know from the Hon'ble Minister how much money is provided for the rest of the year for this purpose?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ತಿಳಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—From the trend the clarifications are sought, it looks as though the Bill has not been sufficiently discussed

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಗಲೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕಾಲವೂ ಮುಗಿಯುತ್ತ ಬಂತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೇ ಹೊರತು ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮುಗಿದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ವೇಳೆಯಾಗುತ್ತ ಬಂತು. ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೇಳಿ. ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಐದು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. The time that has been allotted for this Bill is hardly 30 minutes. When the Minister has replied there is no scope for any other member to make a speech.

The question is:

"That the Mysore Non-Agricultural Loans Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses. Clauses 2 The question is:

"That Clauses 2 to 7, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 7, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1, Title and Preamble. The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I move:

"That the Mysore Non-Agricultural Loans Bill, 1958, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Non-Agricultural Loans Bill, 1958, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we go to the other item, I would like to announce certain things. The number of questions tabled since the General Elections is 4,896; the number of questions admitted and sent to Government up to this day is 4,451, the number of replies received is 2,888, the number of questions answered is 1,787, and the number of replies on hand is 1,101.

In this session the number of questions answered is 500, the number of Short Notice Questions tabled is 51, the number of Short Notice Questions answered is 10, the number of resolutions tabled is 48, the number of resolutions admitted is 47, the number of resolutions moved and withdrawn is 1, the number of Special Resolutions given notice of is 3, the number of Special Resolutions passed is 1, the number of half-an-hour discussion given notice of is 7, the number admitted is 7, the number discussed is 5.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON Q. No. 2042.

Re: Supply of Cement and Steel.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY (Chiknaikanahalli).—This is an important item arising in respect of Question No. 2042, 10th list. It is needless to express the critical position of steel supplies in the State since one year. It has reached almost dead end. There is setback in progress in industrial, agricultural and building programmes. People of this State had to purchase every ton of steel at 50 per cent to 100 per cent extra rate. In 1956-57, Government of Mysore drew about 10,000 tons of steel more than the allotment for Vidhana Soudha and other projects. The Steel Controller of India ordered to adjust this overdrawn quantity about a year back. As a result steel supply was completely cut since then. The market rates immediately shot up by 100 per cent. Thereby more than 10,000 tons, *i.e.*, State's entire need has to be purchased at 600 to 800 rupees extra cost per ton since one year paying additional cost of Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 lakhs (in additon to the value) causing serious black market.

Government here acted as a passive spectator with accumulated inertia. Government could have requested the Centre to spread over this extra drawn quantity over a period of 5 to 6 years or could have saved the situation by requesting to allot imported steel or could have approached Central Government to waive this quantity. For this negligence, why people should be made to suffer?

Every bit of steel required from a C.P. Point to structural section was purchased in black market. Many of the Government Industrial Concerns are not having their basic sections in stock. Very recently one of the Government managed industries had to borrow some steel sections from a private firm. About 90 per cent of the Agricultural Societies of the State are not having any stock of steel sections. By this, the entire agricultural class has suffered and is suffering. The position is extremely worse that at no time in Mysore's history such a thing had occurred.

Sir, even now the position of steel remains the same. Hence, I draw the Government's attention for immediate action and quick relief.